

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include new Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, which include labels identifying structural elements.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action dated November 22, 2004, please consider the following remarks.

In the Office Action issued November 22, 2004, claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as embracing or overlapping two different statutory classes of invention. Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art as shown in Figs. 1 and 2 and the specification of the present application. The drawings were objected to as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims and as requiring labels identifying structural elements.

Claims 1-19 are now pending in this application. The claims have been amended to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1, 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2, and 35 U.S.C. §101. The drawings have been amended to include labels identifying structural elements. No new matter has been added.

The present invention, for example, according to claim 1 as amended, requires:

- providing a first receiving section adapted to receive a first opto-electric transceiver module
- providing a second receiving section adapted to receive a second opto-electric transceiver module

- providing a first electric transceiver module, and
- arranging said first electric transceiver module in said second receiving section rather than the second opto-electric transceiver module

Thus, the key point is that an electric transceiver module is used as a substitute for one of the opto-electric transceiver modules, even though both receiving sections are adapted to receive opto-electric transceiver modules. In particular, claim 1 is a method of connecting a subscriber unit to a fiber optic communication network. In this method a certain interface device is used. This interface device is defined in claim 1. The interface device comprises a first and a second receiving section. Each of these receiving sections is adapted to receive a certain opto-electric transceiver module. The interface device is thus designed to be used with the particular opto-electric transceiver modules defined in claim 1. However, in the method according to the present invention, the interface device is not used with two opto-electric transceiver modules. Instead, the inventor of the present invention has surprisingly found that it may be useful, under certain circumstances, to use the interface device together with an electric transceiver module of the kind defined in claim 1.

With this understanding of the present invention, it is seen that many of the objections and rejections are moot. In particular, claims 1 and 10, as amended, as well as those claims depending therefrom, enable one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention, as required by 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1, as one of skill in the art would learn from the teaching of the specification of the present application how to use an

electric transceiver module as a substitute for one of the opto-electric transceiver modules, even though both receiving sections are adapted to receive opto-electric transceiver modules. Likewise, claims 1 and 10, as amended, as well as those claims depending therefrom, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the application regards as the invention, as required by 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2. In addition, claims 1 and 10 have been amended to clarify that they are process claims in one statutory class of invention, as required by 35 U.S.C. §101. In addition, with this understanding of the present invention, it is seen that the drawings, and specifically Fig. 3, do in fact show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Regarding the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the present invention is not obvious in view of the prior art as shown in Figs. 1 and 2 and the specification of the present application because even if the modification of the prior art suggested by the Examiner were made, the result would not be the present invention, as claimed. Figs. 1 and 2 and the specification of the present application disclose an interface device which includes two opto-electric transceiver modules. The Examiner suggests that it would be obvious to simply eliminate the E/O and O/E converters of the opto-electric transceivers. This is not the present invention as claimed, for example, according to claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 requires that an electric transceiver module is used as a substitute for one of the opto-electric transceiver modules, even though both receiving sections are adapted to receive opto-electric transceiver modules. Thus, the present invention makes no modification to the opto-electric transceivers, but rather uses an

electric transceiver as a substitute for one or more of the opto-electric transceivers, even though the receiving sections are adapted to receive opto-electric transceiver modules. This is different than the modification to the opto-electric transceivers suggested by the Examiner.

As is defined in claim 1, the inventor has, as part of the method, provided the specific electric transceiver module that is defined in claim 1. Since the interface device defined in claim 1 has previously only been used with opto-electric transceivers, it is non-obvious to provide an electric transceiver module that fits into this kind of interface device. Furthermore, it is non-obvious to actually use such a non-obvious electric transceiver module in the manner defined in claim 1. The present invention thus goes completely contrary to the prior art by using an electric connection in a context that is specifically designed and has previously only been used for connecting optical fibers. Indeed, a person skilled in the art would not even think of connecting an electrical output and input to an interface device that is specifically designed for opto-electric transceivers.

Thus, it is seen that the present invention, according to claim 1, and according to claim 10, which is similar to claim 1, is not obvious in view of Figs. 1 and 2 and the specification of the present application. Likewise, the present invention according to claims 2-9, which depend from claim 1, and according to claims 11-19, which depend from claim 10, is not obvious in view of Figs. 1 and 2 and the specification of the present application.

In addition, it is seen that claim 11 defines a preferred embodiment of the method of claim 10, according to which preferred embodiment two electric transceiver modules are used when testing the function of the interface device (it is thereby not necessary to provide any optical signals when testing the function of the device). This feature of the present invention is not disclosed or suggested by Figs. 1 and 2 and the specification of the present application. Thus, for this additional reason, the present invention, according to claim 11, is not obvious in view of Figs. 1 and 2 and the specification of the present application.

Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Additional Fees:

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 19-5127 (19378.0019).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Schwartz
Reg. No. 40,161

Dated: March 17, 2005

Swidler Berlin LLP
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7500